

Note 1, p. 152

As to the date of Wycliffe's quarrel with the friars, it is mentioned in a work as early as the *De Officio Pastoralis* English ed., Matt., 429. How I think it is practically certain that the *De Officio Pastoralis* is of early date, and not after 1380 ; for neither in it nor in the parallel Latin version (edit, by Lechler) is there any mention of the Eucharist controversy, either in the attack on the friars (Matt., 429-44) or in the attack on University teaching (Matt., 427-8). (a) Now in the very similar attack on University teaching in the *Dialogue*, p. 54, cap. 26, he complains of the teaching of heresy on this point, (b) Wycliffe scholars have long agreed that the omission of mention of the Eucharist in passages dealing with the friars is strong evidence of an early date. Dr. Lechler And Mr. Matthew both put the *De Officio Pastoralis* earlier than 1380.

There seems to be no longer any doubt that there were * Poor Priests ' perambulating the country before 1380, though the degree of their connection with Wycliffe and Wycliffism differed in different cases.

(1) They were accused of playing a part in the organisation of the Rising of 1381 (Wright's *Pol. Poems*, K.S., 235-6, and *Rot. Parl.*, iii.

124-5). They must have been working some time and have obtained some influence in order to incur the charge. There is no proof that Wycliffe himself commissioned or sent out any of his own friends before 1381, but some of his doctrines were being preached by irresponsible individuals, e.g. John Ball was accused of preaching against Transubstantiation in 1380.

(2) In the *De Officio Pastoralis* (Matt. 444), whose date we have discussed just above, Wycliffe speaks of the friars getting true preachers stopped and arrested by lords and bishops. It would seem, therefore, that the rivalry of the friars and of Wycliffe's allies was already breaking into open hostility on the field of their labours.

Wycliffe himself says that the hostility shown by the Church to his doctrine of the Eucharist was really due to antipathy aroused by his two former doctrines of the uselessness of religious vows and the wickedness of ecclesiastical endowments (*De Blasphemia*, cap. xviii., 286-7). That is to say, he alleges that he had incurred the hostility of the friars by denouncing the special vows of * religious * orders that cut themselves off from the world, in the same way as he had offended the rest of the Church on the question of endowments, before the Eucharist heresy further complicated matters.

Note 8, p. 155

In the *De Officio Regis* (1379), cap. ii. 29-30, he called it straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel to object to clerical marriage while allowing priests to hold secular office. In the *De Papa* (probably 1380), however, he speaks with respect of the rule of celibacy (Matt., 474) as if he approved of it. But in Sermon no. cv. (*S. E. W.*, i. 364), he distinctly condemns it. These sermons are probably of a later date than the *D**